

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/790,211	AOKI, TAKAAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William Kraig	2815	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William Kraig. (3) _____.

(2) Brian Altmiller. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Aoki et al., Ridley et al. and Tottori (all of record).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

EUGENE LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The combination of Aoki et al., Ridley et al. and Tottori was discussed first. Applicant stated that if the reflow process of Ridley et al. was performed at a higher temperature, the diffusion regions in Ridley et al. could be caused to diffuse more, causing problems in the final structure. The Examiner pointed out that Ridley et al. actually contemplates the use of a higher temperature reflow process by stating that "a thicker or more effective barrier may permit a higher flow temperature".

Applicant then made three suggested claim amendments. Regarding the first proposed claim amendment ("Forming an interlayer, and performing the annealing step before forming the interlayer"), the Examiner stated that, while the amendment would overcome the current rejection, a rejection would probably be made by adding another reference into the current combination of references. Specifically, the Examiner feels that a combination could be made to add an interlayer (other than the current reflowed BPSG layer) above the current structure of Ridley et al. and Aoki et al., as combined. Applicant offered that (and the Examiner agreed) that if it was clearly indicated that the interlayer was directly on the substrate (i.e., there was no intervening BPSG layer) that the amendment would then overcome the prior art of record.

Regarding the second proposed claim amendment ("Forming a source region, and performing the annealing step before forming the source region"), the Examiner stated that said amendment would overcome the prior art of record.

Regarding the third proposed claim amendment ("Forming a diffusion region, and performing the annealing step before forming the diffusion"), the Examiner states that said amendment would overcome the prior art of record.